

Evil Spirits in the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Brief Survey and Some Perspectives

Eibert Tigchelaar

1. Introduction

Synthetic studies of evil spirits in the Dead Sea Scrolls can be found in survey articles on demons or demonology by Philip Alexander, Michael Mach, and Esther Eshel.¹ Many other publications also touch upon the topic of evil spirits in the scrolls, either in the context of the discussion of specific texts, like, e.g., the Two Spirits Treatise or the Songs of the Sage, or when discussing broader topics like angelology, dualism, magic, purity and impurity, or sin.² In addition, there is a

¹Bibliographic references in this contribution will largely be confined to literature of the last twenty years. Cf. Philip S. Alexander, "The Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2.331-53; Michael Mach, "Demons," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 189-92; Esther Eshel and Daniel C. Harlow, "Demons and Exorcism," in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 531-33.

²For example, Philip S. Alexander, "'Wrestling against the Wickedness in High Places': Magic and the Worldview of the Qumran Community," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures. Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans; JSPS 26; Roehampton Institute London Papers 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 318-37; Florentino García Martínez, "Magic in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Metamorphosis of Magic from Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period* (ed. Jan N. Bremmer and Jan R. Veenstra; Groningen Studies in Cultural Change 1; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 13-33; Esther Eshel, "Genres of Magical Texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Die Dämonen · Demons. Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt · The Demonology of Israelite-Jewish and Early Christian Literature in Context of their Environment* (ed. Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and K. F. Diethard Römheld; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 395-415; Eibert Tigchelaar, "These are the names of the spirits of ...": A Preliminary Edition of 4QCatalogue of Spirits (4Q230) and New Manuscript Evidence for the Two Spirits Treatise (4Q257 and 1Q29a)," *RevQ* 21/84 (2004): 529-47; Tigchelaar, "Catalogue of Spirits, Liturgical Manuscript with Angelological Content, Incantation? Reflections on the Character of a Fragment from Qumran (4Q230 1). With Appendix: Edition of the Fragments of IAA #114," in *A Kind of Magic: Understanding Magic in the New Testament and its Religious Environment* (ed. Michael Labahn and Bert Jan Lietaert Peerbolt; LNTS [JSNTS] 306; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 133-46; Gideon Bohak, *Ancient Jewish Magic: A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 105-12, 298-305; Giovanni Ibba, "The Evil Spirits in Jubilees and the Spirit of the Bastards in 4Q510 with Some Remarks on other Qumran Manuscripts," *Henoch* 31 (2009): 111-16; Ida Fröhlich, "Theology and Demonology in Qumran Texts," *Henoch* 32 (2010): 101-29; Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer, "Evil, Dualism, and Community: Who/What Did the Yahad Not Want to Be?" in *Dualism in Qumran* (ed. Géza G. Xeravits; LSTS 76; London: T&T Clark, 2010), 122-47; Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "The Interiorization of Dualism within the Human Being in Second Temple Judaism: The Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS

wealth of studies on evil figures and their relationship to evil spirits in the books of Enoch and Jubilees, or broader in Second Temple Judaism.³ Any study of demonology, of “evil spirits” or other “evil figures” in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and broader in Early Jewish texts, encounters methodological questions and problems, pertaining to the interpretation of terms and of ancient concepts, and of the discursive functions of the terms and concepts. This contribution cannot discuss any of those comprehensively and synthetically, but will offer some perspectives, particularly referring to some recent studies.

2. Terminology

2.1. The words בליעל, שטן, משטמה and מלכי רשע are often viewed as names (Belial, Satan, Mastema, Melkiresha) of the evil figure par excellence, the “angel of darkness” (1QS 3:21).⁴ Within the scrolls, there is no evidence of a personal name Mastema.⁵ Rather, the use of the article with the noun in constructs like שר המשטמה (“the prince of hostility”), מאלך המשטמה (“the angel of hostility”),⁶ מלאכי המשטמות (“angels of hostility”) already rules out this interpretation, even though the translators of Jubilees did interpret the noun as a proper name. The noun שטן is rarely

III: 13–IV: 26) in Its Tradition-Historical Context,” in *Light Against Darkness: Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World* (ed. Armin Lange et al.; JAJSup 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 145–68; Mladen Popović, “Light and Darkness in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* (1QS III 13–IV 26) and in 4Q186,” *ibid.*, 148–65; Miryam T. Brand, *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature* (JAJSup 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013); Menahem Kister, “Body and Sin: Romans and Colossians in Light of Qumranic and Rabbinic Texts,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature* (ed. Jean-Sébastien Rey; STDJ 102; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 171–207.

³Cf., e.g., John R. Levison, *The Spirit in First Century Judaism* (AGJU 29; Leiden: Brill, 2002); James C. VanderKam, “The Demons in the *Book of Jubilees*,” in Lange et al., *Die Dämonen*, 339–64; Archie Wright, *The Origin of Evil Spirits: The Reception of Genesis 6.1–4 in Early Jewish Literature* (WUNT 2.198; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); Todd R. Hanneken, “Angels and Demons in the Book of Jubilees and Contemporary Apocalypses,” *Henoch* 28/2 (2006): 11–25; Jacques T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, “Angels and Demons in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings: Origins, Development and Reception* (ed. Friedrich V. Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas, and Karin Schöpflin; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 585–609; Levison, *Filled with the Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); Henryk Drawnel, “The Mesopotamian Background of the Enochic Giants and Evil Spirits,” *DSD* 21 (2014): 14–38.

⁴Cf., more extensively in this volume, the article of Annette Steudel.

⁵On משטמה and בליעל, cf. Devorah Dimant, “Between Qumran Sectarian and Qumran Nonsectarian Texts: The Case of Belial and Mastema,” in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies* (FAT 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 135–51.

⁶מלאך משטמה in 1QM 13:11 may mean “an angel of hostility,” but since this entire section is poetical and does not use the article, it could also be determinate: “the angel of hostility” (*pace* Dimant, “The Case of Belial and Mastema,” 141).

used, and constructs like כל שטן (“every adversary”) and אין שטן (“without adversary”) indicate that in those texts שטן is not a proper name.⁷ Only in 11Q5 19:15 (in the “Plea for Deliverance”) the phrase אל תשלט בי שטן ורוח טמאה, might be understood as: “Let Satan and an impure spirit not rule over me.”⁸ However, there is no reason to assume that שטן is here a proper name, and the parallelism with רוח טמאה rather suggests the understanding “Let neither adversary, nor unclean spirit have dominion over me,” where שטן is a “type or class of evil spirit.”⁹ In many texts בליעל seems to be a specific figure, named Belial. However, in other cases the same word may be a common noun, “worthlessness” or “wickedness.”

2.2. The concept of “demon” (Greek δαίμων and δαιμόνιον) has developed from classical and pagan Greek where the word signified “both gods and lesser spirits ... either benevolent or malevolent” to early Christian parlance where it mainly refers to “demons as evil spirits.”¹⁰ Thus, in the New Testament the word is rarely used in the sense of (foreign) divinities as subject of worship,¹¹ and largely, especially in the Gospels, as evil entities or spirits that can enter and possess human beings, for which also the verb δαιμονίζομαι is used. In the LXX translations of Hebrew Bible books, the classical meaning is found in Deut 32:17 and Ps 105[106]:37 where it renders Hebrew שֵׁד, while its use in Ps 90[91]:6 may reflect a reading ושד or ושיד (where MT reads יָשׁוּד). In the few other cases it corresponds to MT אֱלִילִים (idols; Ps 95[96]:5), שְׂעִירִים (goat-demons; Isa 13:21), צִיִּים (desert-dweller; Isa 34:14). Aramaic שֵׁד is used four or five times in the Qumran Aramaic fragments of Tobit,¹² corresponding to δαιμόνιον in the Greek versions of Tobit; in the Pseudo-Danielic manuscripts 4Q243 and 4Q244, quoting Ps 106:37; and with very little context in 4Q547 (Visions of Amram) and 4Q564. In the Hebrew scrolls, שֵׁד is found repeatedly in 11Qapocryphal Psalms (11Q11),¹³ where it is clearly a malevolent being. 4Q386 1 iii 4 (Pseudo-Ezekiel) refers to the site of Babylon after its destruction as a מדור שדים, a dwelling-place of demons, possibly as a paraphrase of Isa 13:21. The most famous occurrence is in 4Q510 (Songs of the Sage) 1 5, where the instructor proclaims God’s splendor in order to terrify אדם לילית אחים

⁷On the use of שטן in the Scrolls and Early Jewish literature, cf. Armin Lange, “Satanic Verses: The Adversary in the Qumran Manuscripts and Elsewhere,” *RevQ* 24/93 (2009): 35-48.

⁸Thus, David Flusser, “Qumrân and Jewish ‘Apotropaic’ Prayers,” *IEJ* 16 (1966): 194-205. Cf. similarly J. A. Sanders in *DJD* 4:78.

⁹Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael E. Stone and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document. Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 129-131. Cf. also Lange, “Satanic Verses,” 39, 48: “category of demonic beings.”

¹⁰Cf. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, “The Notion of Demon: Open Questions to a Diffuse Concept,” in Lange et al., *Die Dämonen*, 23-41, at 38.

¹¹E.g., Acts 17:18; 1 Cor 10:20-21; Rev 9:20.

¹²4Q196 14 i 5, 12 (Tob 6:15, 18); 4Q197 4 i 13 (Tob 6:8); 4 ii 9, 13 (Tob 6:15-16).

¹³Though only once the reading is fully ascertained (II 3 וְהַשְׁדִּים).

“all the spirits of the angels of destruction and the spirits of the bastards, demon, hyenas, Lilith, howlers.”¹⁴

2.3. The common term for “spirit” is רוח, where generally only the context indicates the specific nature and the quality of the spirit(s). Already in the Hebrew Bible, we encounter construct phrases such as רוח זנונים, “a spirit of whoredom” (Hos 4:12; 5:4), רוח שקר, “a lying spirit” (1 Kgs 22:22-23; 2 Chr 18:21-22), רוח הטמאה, “the unclean spirit” (Zech 13:2), or רוח חכמה ובינה, “a spirit of wisdom and understanding” (Isa 11:2). In the Hebrew Bible those are only rarely personified. The clearest case is the “lying spirit” in 1 Kings 22:19-22. Compared to the use of רוח in the Hebrew Bible, three things are noteworthy. First, in the Hebrew Bible the plural רוחות is almost always used for “winds,” and only a few times for “spirits.”¹⁵ The scrolls, however, frequently use the plural “spirits,” as reference to angelic spirits, evil spirits, as well as virtues and vices. Second, both in the singular and the plural, in the Scrolls spirits are more often qualified in construct phrases by abstract nouns. Third, in many cases a distinction between figure, power, and virtue or vice is unclear.

Many of the common terms for “evil spirits” are attested, though some rarely, in the Scrolls. Thus, the common Greek πνεῦμα πονηρόν (often plural πνεύματα πονηρά) might reflect רוח רעה or רוח הרעה.¹⁶ However, in the Hebrew scrolls this phrase is only attested, and not even with certainty, twice in 4Q511 (15 7 and 81 3). The Aramaic equivalent for “evil spirit” (רוח באישה) is found in a few texts: 1QapGen 20:16-17, 28, and partly in 29; possibly in 4Q197 4 i 13 (Tob 6:8); in 4Q538 1-2 4, and perhaps in 4Q560 1 ii 6. The more commonly used term in the New Testament, “unclean spirit” (πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον)¹⁷ is also used in LXX Zech 13:2 to render רוח הטמאה.¹⁸ In the

¹⁴I read here with the manuscript שד אים. Often this is read שדאים and taken to be a strange spelling of שדיים. E.g., Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: ben Zvi, 2011-2015), 2:316. But nowhere else do we find אים endings, unless א is part of the root, or as marker of a glide (לואים, גואים). Possibly Baillet, DJD 7:217 therefore explains: “Ici la graphie semble destinée à marquer la caractère terrifiant des démons, la racine אים significant ‘avoir peur.’” But this does not explain the space in the manuscript, and I prefer to read two words, which one can read in two ways: (1) שד אים, “terrible demon.” But then one might expect איום, as in 1QpHab 3:2 איום for Hab 1:7. (2) שד אים, “demon, hyenas.” As Chanan Ariel and Alexey Yuditsky (see note in Qimron). For אים, “hyenas,” cf. Isa 13:22; 34:14; Jer 50:39, in Isa 34:14 together with לילית. In Isa 13:22 the scribe of 1QIsa^a first wrote אא, and then added one *yod* supralinearly: אים (and note that Isa 13:21 has the אחים).

¹⁵In Num 16:22; 27:16 and Prov 16:2 it refers to the spirits of living beings. In Ps 104:4 רוחות could be either “winds” or angelic “spirits.”

¹⁶Cf., e.g., the collocations in Judg 9:23; 1 Sam 16:14-16, 23; 18:10; 19:9 and the LXX translations.

¹⁷See Clinton Wahlen, *Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels* (WUNT 2.185; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

¹⁸See Armin Lange, “Considerations Concerning the ‘Spirit of Impurity’ in Zech 13:2,” in Lange, Lichtenberger, and Diethard Römheld, *Die Dämonen*, 254-68;

scrolls, that Hebrew term is only attested in 4Q230 11 (partially reconstructed) and 4Q444 1-4 i 8, and, without the article, in 11Q5 19:5 טמאה אל תשלט בי שטן ורוח, already quoted above. The association of evil spirits with Belial, as repeatedly expressed in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, is found more often: CD 12:2 mentions “the spirits of Belial,” and there are about eight references to “(all) the spirits of his lot,” where the suffix refers to Belial, or, in 1QS 3, to the “angel of darkness.”

Other expressions for evil spirits in general are רוחות ממזרים (also רוחי ממזרים), “the spirits of the bastards”; רוח(ים) רשע(ה), “spirit(s) of wickedness,” עולה רוח(ות), “spirits of falsehood.” Collocations of spirits with specific kinds of evil are found in phrases such as רוח תופלה, “spirit of insolence” and רוח בזו, “spirit of contempt” in 4Q230; רוח זנות, “spirit of adultery” and perhaps also רוח נדה, “spirit of uncleanness” in the Treatise of the Two Spirits; רוח שקר, “a lying spirit,” in the Barkhi Napshi text; רוח אפעה, “spirits of venomous vanity” and רוח הוות, “spirit of destruction” in the Hodayot; רוחי ריב, “spirits of strife” in 4Q444; and רוחי הבלים, “spirits of vanity” and רוח חבל, “spirit of destruction” in Songs of the Sage.

2.4. Parallelisms with some of the terms discussed above, might also indicate that other terms referred to “evil spirits.” This holds for משחית, “destroyer,” or פעלי און, “workers of evil.”

3. Concepts

3.1. While earlier scholars attempted to construct a coherent world-view from the Dead Sea Scrolls, nowadays there are different models of heterogeneity. Most commonly one distinguishes between a more or less coherent world-view attested in a small group of so-called sectarian texts, and a larger group of other texts that are related to, or more distant from, the sectarian texts. Variations may be due to developments over time within the writings, or because of different provenances of texts. As a result, there are not only terminological differences between texts, but also conceptual ones. Thus, texts like the Plea for Deliverance (11Q5 19), referring to שטן as an adversary and to an evil inclination, or the Cave 11 apocryphal Psalms (11Q11), an apotropaic text against demons, hardly are consistent with other texts. Similarly, concepts of “evil spirits” in the Book of Watchers or Jubilees may have influenced later texts, but that does not rule out developments and divergences.

3.2. Throughout the Dead Sea Scrolls, and some other Early Jewish texts, there are conceptual overlaps between “spirits” and other entities. Thus, the terms “angels” and “spirits” are sometimes interchanged or juxtaposed.¹⁹ In Jub. 2:2 “all the spirits who serves before him” are listed as different categories of angels, such as the angels of the presence, the angels of holiness, etc. Again in a creation context, in 1QH^a 9:11-15, specific heavenly phenomena, spirits, and angels are juxtaposed: “powerful angels ... before they came to be holy angels ... eternal spirits in their dominions: luminaries ... stars ... storm winds ... shooting stars and lightning.” But also evil spirits are associated with angels: 1QM 13:11-12 states that “all the spirits of his [i.e., of Belial] lot, the angels

¹⁹See also Cecilia Wassen, “מַלְאָךְ *mal'āk*,” *ThWQ* 2:675-82.

of destruction, walk in the statutes of darkness.”²⁰ Another association exists between evil spirits and the giants who were born from the Watchers and the daughters of men. This is expressed in the phrase *רוחות (ה) ממזרים*, “spirits of the bastards,” which refers back to the Book of Watchers which calls the giants “bastards” (cf. 1 Enoch 10:9) and gives an aetiology of the evil spirits as the spirits of the dead giants (1 Enoch 15:9-12). Jubilees 10 omits the reference to giants, and simply declares the watchers to have been the fathers of the evil spirits. Interestingly, also the angels themselves are sometimes called *גבורים*, “giants,” and may as such be identified as “spirits.” Cf., 1QH^a 16:12-13. It is not quite clear how *שד* and evil spirit are distinguished. Tobit 6:8, “a demon or an evil spirit” suggests that they were similar but somehow different. The long list of 4Q510 1 which refers to “all the spirits of the angels of destruction and the spirits of the bastards” continues with a mini catalogue of demon like figures, including *שד*, but also the demon-like desert dweller, such as the *איים*, “hyenas,” *לילית*, “screech owl” or Lilith, and *אחים*, “owls” or “howlers.” It has been suggested that the female figure in 4Q184 (Wiles of the Wicked Woman) has Lilith-like demonic traits.²¹ Though one would not readily refer to this woman as an evil spirit, there are some conceptual connections.

3.3. A different kind of conceptual fuzziness consists with regard to the word *רוח* itself. Modern dictionaries and studies of necessity distinguish between different meanings, ranging from “wind,” through “breath,” to “spirit,” and draw distinctions between spirit as human disposition and as personified beings,²² but while those may seem clear-cut categories, they might have overlapped in ancient conceptualizations. Thus, in the Two Spirits Treatise (1QS 3:13-4:26) the two spirits are at initially described as two cosmological figures, but at some places in the treatise it is easier to understand these spirits as internalized dispositions towards good and evil. But also with respect to specific dispositions, or virtues and vices, the texts do not always shed clear light on the ancient conceptualizations. When evil spirits are described as “angels of destruction” or “angels of hostility,” this suggest a conceptualization of evil threatening man from outside. However, phrases like “spirits of falsehood” or “spirit of contempt” rather reflect an internalization. From this perspective, also the “evil inclination” shares an overlap with “evil spirits.” The only Dead Sea Scroll text where the “evil inclination” is in fact mentioned together with evil spirits is in the already mentioned Plea for Deliverance: the prayer ““Let neither adversary, nor unclean spirit have dominion over me,” is followed immediately by *מכאוב ויצר רע אל ירשו בעצמי*, “let neither pain nor evil inclination have power over my bones.”

²⁰For *רוחי מלאכי חבל*, cf. also texts: CD 2:6; 1QS 4:12; 4Q510 1 5 (*רוחי מלאכי חבל*).

²¹Joseph M. Baumgarten, “On the Nature of the Seductress in 4Q184,” *RevQ* 15/57–58 (1991): 133–43

²²In scholarship many more and often different categories are suggested. For example, Arthur Everett Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1989), posited five different “biblical” categories: references to God’s spirit, to man’s spirit, to angelic or demonic beings, to wind, or to breath.

3.4. The problem of concept also pertains to our own conceptualizations. Anders Petersen challenges the ontologizing concept of demons as evil spirits, since that concept originated specifically in the discourse of Early Christianity. Instead he proposes an approach that is concerned with meaning: “The concept of demon does not signify an objective fact in the world. It constitutes a category of meaning that enables human beings to communicate about things beyond their own nature.”²³ He himself proposes a definition that focuses on function. In a biting review, also Gideon Bohak asked why scholars are concerned with demons: “Do we want to learn how demons fit in each culture’s conceptual or theological frameworks? Do we wish to learn more about the sociological functions of such beliefs within a given society? Do we seek to use the discourse of demons to learn more about a society’s fears and fantasies and the symbolic resources its religion and culture provided?”²⁴

I published three articles between 2004 and 2008 relating on evil spirits. Two were on the text 4Q230 (which I had rediscovered), named by Milik “Catalogue of Spirits,” which I mainly discussed within the larger context of Dead Sea Scrolls and Early Jewish literature.²⁵ A third article was a brief overview of “the evil inclination” in the Scrolls.²⁶ My conceptualization of “evil spirits” was at the time mainly based on Shaul Shaked’s interpretation of the spirits in the Two Spirits Treatise in the light of the Zoroastrian concepts of spirit;²⁷ on the idea, attested both in magical texts and elsewhere in the Scrolls, of a connection between evil spirits, vices, and specific bodily parts;²⁸ on David Flusser’s brief article on the association between and partial interchange of iniquity, “satan,” unclean spirit, and evil inclination; and lastly, on Philip Alexander’s observation of the important role of a, or the, *maskil*, who, through revealed knowledge about the nature of spirits, can defend himself and his community from evil.²⁹ More recently, I touched upon “evil

²³Petersen, “The Notion of Demon.”

²⁴Gideon Bohak, “Review of Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and K. F. Diethard Römheld, *Die Dämonen—Demons*,” *JSJ* 37 (2006): 123-27 at 124.

²⁵Tigchelaar, “These are the names of the spirits of ...”; and “Catalogue of Spirits.”

²⁶Eibert Tigchelaar, “The Evil Inclination in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with a Re-edition of 4Q468i (4QSectorian Text?),” in *Empsychoi Logoi — Religious Innovations in Antiquity: Studies in Honour of Pieter Willem van der Horst* (ed. Alberdina Houtman, Albert de Jong, and Magda Misset-van de Weg; *AJEC* 73; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 347-57.

²⁷Shaul Shaked, “The Notions *mēnōg* and *gētīg* in the Pahlavi Texts and their Relation to Eschatology,” *Acta Orientalia* 33 (1971): 59-107; and “Qumran and Iran: Further Considerations,” *Israel Oriental Studies* 2 (1972): 433-46.

²⁸At the time, I failed to refer to George J. Brooke, “Body Parts in Barkhi Nafshi and the Qualifications for Membership of the Worshipping Community,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998* (ed. Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller; *STDJ* 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 79-94, because, in spite of some correspondences, he developed his argument into another direction.

²⁹Alexander, “Wrestling against the Wickedness in High Places”

spirits” in a larger article on holy spirit in the Dead Sea Scrolls,³⁰ which was influenced by conceptualizations that I encountered in more recent literature.

My holy spirit article does not reference Troels Engberg-Pedersen’s, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit*, because it has no direct references to holy spirit in the scrolls. Engberg-Pedersen argues that Paul’s world-view, in particular his speaking about *pneuma*, must be understood against Stoic cosmology. For Paul *pneuma* is both psychic and physical or material. Engberg-Pedersen gives a Stoic Pauline interpretation to the texts where Paul speaks of *pneuma*, and more generally of Paul’s entire world-view. Some of those *pneuma* sections, are reminiscent of wordings or ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls (e.g., bodily transformation through the spirit), which is not surprising given Paul’s connections to Palestinian Judaism. While Engberg-Pedersen only superficially discusses the possible Jewish origins of specific ideas (e.g., holy spirit dwelling in the body and the community, or the relation between spirit and body), he does probe into the concrete conceptual meanings of such expressions. A Stoic interpretation of the Scrolls is out of the question,³¹ as most Stoic concepts are alien to the world-view of the scrolls. However, the book challenges us to think much more concretely and physically about spirit and spirits,³² also in the scrolls, rather than taking them as mythic or metaphorical language.

Albert de Jong’s contribution on Iranian connections in the Scrolls³³ continues the tendency among Iranologists to detect structural parallels between Iranian ideas and notions and some of the Qumran sectarian texts. In comparison to earlier studies, de Jong offers several new contributions. He discusses more explicitly the possible historical contexts and channels that could explain Iranian elements in the Dead Sea Scrolls. He analyzes the Two Spirits Treatise from a Zoroastrian point of view, pointing both at many parallels and at substantial differences, and suggest that “there is a structural dilemma within the 1QS instruction on the two spirits, which can most economically be solved by allowing for a combination of two different ‘patters of belief’: the recognition, demanded by biblical tradition, that God is one, and is thus responsible for everything, and the (perhaps intuitive) notion tht the world is currently going through a struggle dominated by two spiritual beings, representing good and evil.”³⁴ De Jong observes not only the

³⁰Eibert Tigchelaar “Historical Origins of the Early Christian Concept of the Holy Spirit: Perspectives from the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Holy Spirit, Inspiration, and the Cultures of Antiquity: Multidisciplinary Perspectives* (ed. Jörg Frey and John R. Levison; Ekstasis 5; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 167-240, esp. 228-33.

³¹Corrado Martone, “Qumran and Stoicism: An Analysis of Some Common Traits,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 617-22 suggests that some common traits might be traced back to Babylonia.

³²For a much more sober and cautious discussion of Stoic *pneuma*, see Teun Tieleman, “The Spirit of Stoicism,” in Frey and Levison, *The Holy Spirit*, 39-62.

³³Albert de Jong, “Iranian Connections in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 479-500.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 493.

structural correspondence between Iranian thought and the Two Spirits Treatise that spirits are both cosmic entities, embodiments of values, and their human affects. He also relates this to the idea of spiritual beings indwelling in the human body, and the rituals of cursing Belial and his spirits.³⁵ In short, de Jong revitalizes the heuristic value of a conceptualization of spirits in the Dead Sea Scrolls in the line of Zoroastrian ideas of spirit.

Ishay Rosen-Zvi's book on the evil inclination presents a different perspective.³⁶ in his study of both *yetzer ra'* and the *yetzer* of the wicked in the Scrolls, he sharply contrasts references to demons from outside with the development of the notion of *yetzer* which dwells within humans. While the Dead Sea Scrolls are witness to the first steps of a reification or ontologization of *yetzer*, they also attest, for Rosen-Zvi, an inward motion of demonology, where *yetzer* is an example of one of the "intermediate demonic figures ... found living inside humans and tempting them to sin."³⁷ He thus both acknowledges its demonological context, but emphasizes the anthropological one, where *yetzer* explains the tendency of human beings to sin. Rosen-Zvi presents a different framework from which to look at demonic figures and inclinations, and specifically pays attention to the different discourses throughout the development of Judaism.

A more theoretical approach of the same materials is given by Carol Newsom, who combines a model from indigenous psychologies about the subjective experience of self and control with an analysis of the language and conceptual metaphors related to "spirit," "flesh," and "inclination" in the Hebrew Bible and different Dead Sea Scrolls.³⁸ Thus, for example, the giving of God's (holy) spirit in (ב rather than על) the hymnist of the Hodayot, shows that "the originally external spirit from god becomes conceptualized as moving from outside to inside. Nor is the self construed any longer as a simple autonomous subject."³⁹

4. Discourses

The attention not only for terms and figures, but also and especially for concepts and conceptualizations, and new models, raises larger questions of discourse and function. This calls for broader studies and comparisons of texts over a larger period of time, such as, e.g., Rosen-Zvi's study of (evil) inclination in Second Temple Judaism, some Early Christian texts, and different Rabbinic schools. But is also requires careful study and comparison of individual texts, like those

³⁵Ibid., 494-95.

³⁶Ishay Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires: Yetzer Hara and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), esp. 44-64 (ch. 3 *Yetzer* at Qumran: Proto-Rabbinic?).

³⁷Ibid., 53.

³⁸Carol A. Newsom, "Flesh, Spirit, and the Indigenous Psychology of the *Hodayot*," in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday* (ed. Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner, and Cecilia Wassen; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 339-54; and "Models of the Moral Self: Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Judaism," *JBL* 131 (2012): 5-25.

³⁹Newsom, "Flesh," 350,

leading to Newsom's conclusions about two different models for the self in the Hodayot and in the Two Spirits Treatise.⁴⁰ Therefore, general statements about discourse and function can only be tentative, in need of more research.

4.1. Even though a text like the Book of Watchers is concerned with the origin or aetiology of evil and evil spirits, many of the Dead Sea Scrolls are less interested in such mythic explanations. Instead, they seem to be more concerned in providing an explanation for human sinfulness. This is also reflected in the distance between texts like the Book of Watchers, the Book of Giants, or Tobit, which provide proper names for their evil protagonists, such as the demon Asmodeus, and the namelessness of the host of spirits of the lot of Belial, which at most are referred to by the sinful affects they work in people. Implied in this discourse about human sinfulness is the question to what extent the urge or temptation to sin comes from the outside or the inside.

4.2. Newsom argues that the question of human sinfulness is part of a larger discourse about the self, the body, and agency, in relationship to both good and evil. From that perspective, the texts' statements on evil spirits and on holy spirit cannot be divorced, but represent different aspects of that larger discourse. From that perspective, Joseph Angel's study of the Songs of the Sage rightly emphasizes that these texts are not simply apotropaic, to provide protection from demons and evil spirits. Rather, it is only by the attainment of the ideals of the Qumran community, and the experienced communion with angels, that one is protected from the evil spirits.⁴¹

⁴⁰Summary in Newsom, "Flesh," 353-54.

⁴¹Joseph Angel, "Maskil, Community, and Religious Experience in the *Songs of the Sage* (4Q510-511)," *DSD* 19 (2012): 1-27.